

country was not true, it could not exist a year. But religion is true, and it is saddled for the time
Yours,

SPEECH *In the M*
On the Quest
ment to the C
"No person
any office in
between born
Mr. SPEAK
leman from
previously he
prepared to be
an accidenta
locality of a
bility to offer
useful he may
he resides;
spirited; his
business and
wealth; his
may be in
cluded from
because he
States! And
this country
one year, or
though he
foreign Coast
iron flange
collection of
he might be
institutions,
strong attack
that he him
until after
point whether
smallest degree
all the prop
This seems to
scriptive.
The prece
stance over
demerit accord
none of us c
the light. I
they were be
this respect,
parents in c
in manhood
in dim and
keep no rec
over exaltat
tion overspr
children of
hood, would
on this poin
themselves
"American"
could demon
can" in feel
tally quant
of reliable
sided here th
quisite—wh
year;—and
hands about
that we can
such person
Birth, con
are arrang
wish or pre
consulted, I
breadth of
friend, the
dminative
of the whole
on the whole
The locality
I hope we
loan" idea
ally and am
very "Am
eigner" by
that they
sole as in
Dr. Bigelow
Boston, wh
born in th
him on the
ment, that
loper here,
the line of
"None to
motto of th
has been m
during this
the doctor
in the sens
merely to
graphical
in interpre
ed, neither
Americans?
who are fa
sympathy
in human
State are
ists to all
pathy, and
the people
such "Am
our Comm
can," I m
"America
pathy, and
termine as
verdict, Mr.
vised fr
station fr
was born
the gentl
that I der
land, he
dignation
that any
Though a
ly follow
Neither
publican
Europe,
Kossuth,
some pro
ment of
of the A
democr
fluences
the Fug
A. Doug
have "re
We m
all these
other pe
are bore
tives of
lither,
publican
the South
and pol
pathy de
be den
Virginia
this, so
ing for
Catholi
times la
time pe

SPEECH OF JOHN PRINCE, OF ESSEX.

In the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

On the Question of adopting the following as an Amendment to the Constitution:

"No person shall be entitled to vote, or be eligible to any office in this Commonwealth, unless he shall have been born within the jurisdiction of the United States."

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Ipswich, (Mr. Carey,) and which we have previously had before us in another form, I do not feel prepared to adopt. I dislike the idea of making such a change in the Constitution, and I do not think it wise to do so.

free common schools. Romanists had enough in this respect, without doubt; but when and where have they ever attempted anything worse than has been realized in Virginia and other portions of the South?

So far as republicanism for office may be concerned, of what advantage would it be for a man to be born, educated and disciplined in Missouri? Events of recent occurrence in the Territory of Kansas may serve to illustrate the sort of "republicanism" which actuates some of the people of Missouri, who went over the Kansas boundary line, fraudulently assumed the right to vote in the organization of the Territory, threatened to hang Governor Reader if he should interpose any barrier to their villany, overruled the civil officers generally, and thus trampled upon decency, law, order and justice! And all for the purpose of subjugating that region of country to the domination of chattel slavery!

The following I have clipped from a telegraphic report, in the newspapers, of the speech of Gov. Reader, of Kansas, on his late visit to Pennsylvania. What a picture does it present of the principles and practices of natives of one portion of our country! How much republicanism would a person be likely to breathe into his soul in consequence of being born in a community of such rowdies as are herein described?

"He referred to the reports of frauds and outrages upon the part of slavery men in the Kansas election, and emphatically condemned the very worst statements of them, which had preceded his arrival. He said his opinions on the subject of popular sovereignty had undergone no change, but that the conduct of the people of the border counties of the north of Missouri had astonished and amazed him by their reckless disregard of all laws, compacts and constitutions; that the territory of Kansas in her late election had been invaded by a regular organized army, armed to the teeth, who took possession of the ballot-boxes, and made a Legislature to suit the purposes of the pro-slavery party. Kansas was subdued, subjugated and conquered by armed men from Missouri, but her citizens were resolved never to give up the fight for their freedom, and the independence of their soil from foreign control or interference."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are some evils in this country besides those resulting from foreign emigration—some equally great, and as likely to sap the foundations of our republican institutions.

When have the naturalized foreigners in any part of our country been guilty of anything equal in enormity to the recent conduct of the Missourians? In this case, it should be observed, the persons of whom I complain were in the strictest sense the aggressors.

What sort of a republican education would one receive if brought up at the feet of the civil authorities and teachers of law and politics in Georgia—the State which offered, through its Legislature, \$1000 reward for the head of a "Native American"—a son of Massachusetts by birth, (Wm. Lloyd Garrison,)—who all his life has been battling in behalf of universal freedom? What kind of a "republicanism" was caltured by Gov. Hammond, George McDuffie, and Calhoun, when they declared that slavery existed by divine right, that it was of "patriarchal" origin and authority, and that it was even the "corner-stone" of the American government? How much better would any man be, for having been born and reared in the midst of such teachers, than if born in England or Germany, or even in Austria?

One of the members from Boston (Mr. Farwell) has, during this discussion, quoted the saying attributed to Washington, "Put none but Americans on guard!" His application of it is, that we should elect none but Americans to office, under any circumstances. Allow me, as I have said before, to define what makes an American, and I do not object to the doctrine. But I think there is not a little cast in this frequent reiteration of the alleged danger of having any other persons "on guard" than those born on American soil. Who, let me ask, sought to betray the cause of freedom, the native Frenchman? or Kosciuszko, the native of Poland? or Baran de Kuly, the native German? or Richard Montgomery, the native Englishman? No! It was a "Native American"—Benjamin Arnold—who was born in the wooden-nutting State of Connecticut! No true patriot or more devoted soldier participated in the struggle of the colonies against Great Britain, than was Baron de Steuben, the native Prussian, who cast in his lot with our Revolutionary sires, and, but for the timely aid of the State of New York in the grant of land, and a generous pension from Congress, would have died in poverty. He sought not to secure even posthumous distinction or homage, but made an earnest request that his body might not be buried with pomp and display, but wrapped in a cloak, and deposited in an obscure place, with no monument to mark the spot. Not one of his contemporaries was more shocked and grieved than he at the treacherous and perfidious character of Arnold. Says a historian of the time, "So great was his abhorrence of every thing mean and contemptible, that he could never endure the name of General Arnold, after that dishonorable officer proved a traitor to his country. While reviewing a regiment of light horse, the name of Arnold happened to strike his ear. The man who bore it was ordered to the front. He was a fine-looking fellow, with horse and equipments in excellent order. 'Change your name, brother soldier,' said the Baron, 'you are too respectable to bear the name of a traitor!' Verily, there is considerable nonsense in the implied assumption of a necessity that one should prove himself native-born, before he can be trusted out of sight!

To be consistent, and legitimately extend the ultra 'native' idea, those gentlemen who pertinaciously urge the proposition now before us, should seek further to amend the Constitution by providing that no one should be eligible to office in our State unless born within the limits of Massachusetts; and still further, that no one should be a County Commissioner, Treasurer, Register of Deeds, or Register of Probate, unless born within the County; and further yet, that no one should be a Representative in any town in the Legislature, unless a native of that town. In case of the adoption of such amendments, our friend from Ipswich would be disfranchised in this Commonwealth; for he was born; when he replied, 'In Ireland.' But, said the gentleman, 'did you not see by the advertisement that I did not wish to employ an Irishman?' To this, the other rejoined by saying that, though born in Ireland, he was no Irishman; and he added, with some indignation, 'Suppose, sir, a man was born in a stable, is that any reason that he is a horse?' [Laughter.] Though a man be born in America, it does not necessarily follow that he is characteristically an American. Neither is a man necessarily a monarchist or anti-republican in theory or in feeling, because he was born in Europe, or elsewhere outside the limits of a republic. Kosciuszko, Mazini, and hundreds of men the other side of the Atlantic, are every whit better republicans than those prominent leaders in our own country at this moment, who are loud-mouthed in their professions of democracy. What kind of 'Americanism' is it that in the fugitive slave bill, or Senator Butler, or Stephen A. Douglas, or Franklin Pierce? Such 'Americanism' have ruled America too long!

We might with as good propriety render ineligible all those born in Virginia, South Carolina, and some other portions of the United States, as hundreds who are born in England or Germany. Many who are natives of the last-named countries and who emigrate hither, are from their youth upward genuine, hearty republicans; while many who were born and reared in the Southern States, in the midst of the blighting social and political influences of chattel slavery, are in sympathy with despotic, and hold office in Massachusetts. What sort of republicanism training and education would be derived from the political and social atmosphere of Virginia, where Mr. Douglas was imprisoned for keeping a school to teach free colored children to read; and this, too, when he was having 'all for love and nothing for reward'?

One great complaint against the Roman Catholicism, (a complaint repeated on this floor several times this session, and which we have expressed through some laws passed here,) is that they aim to keep the people in ignorance, and are for this reason hostile to

free common schools. Romanists had enough in this respect, without doubt; but when and where have they ever attempted anything worse than has been realized in Virginia and other portions of the South?

So far as republicanism for office may be concerned, of what advantage would it be for a man to be born, educated and disciplined in Missouri? Events of recent occurrence in the Territory of Kansas may serve to illustrate the sort of "republicanism" which actuates some of the people of Missouri, who went over the Kansas boundary line, fraudulently assumed the right to vote in the organization of the Territory, threatened to hang Governor Reader if he should interpose any barrier to their villany, overruled the civil officers generally, and thus trampled upon decency, law, order and justice! And all for the purpose of subjugating that region of country to the domination of chattel slavery!

The following I have clipped from a telegraphic report, in the newspapers, of the speech of Gov. Reader, of Kansas, on his late visit to Pennsylvania. What a picture does it present of the principles and practices of natives of one portion of our country! How much republicanism would a person be likely to breathe into his soul in consequence of being born in a community of such rowdies as are herein described?

"He referred to the reports of frauds and outrages upon the part of slavery men in the Kansas election, and emphatically condemned the very worst statements of them, which had preceded his arrival. He said his opinions on the subject of popular sovereignty had undergone no change, but that the conduct of the people of the border counties of the north of Missouri had astonished and amazed him by their reckless disregard of all laws, compacts and constitutions; that the territory of Kansas in her late election had been invaded by a regular organized army, armed to the teeth, who took possession of the ballot-boxes, and made a Legislature to suit the purposes of the pro-slavery party. Kansas was subdued, subjugated and conquered by armed men from Missouri, but her citizens were resolved never to give up the fight for their freedom, and the independence of their soil from foreign control or interference."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are some evils in this country besides those resulting from foreign emigration—some equally great, and as likely to sap the foundations of our republican institutions.

When have the naturalized foreigners in any part of our country been guilty of anything equal in enormity to the recent conduct of the Missourians? In this case, it should be observed, the persons of whom I complain were in the strictest sense the aggressors.

What sort of a republican education would one receive if brought up at the feet of the civil authorities and teachers of law and politics in Georgia—the State which offered, through its Legislature, \$1000 reward for the head of a "Native American"—a son of Massachusetts by birth, (Wm. Lloyd Garrison,)—who all his life has been battling in behalf of universal freedom? What kind of a "republicanism" was caltured by Gov. Hammond, George McDuffie, and Calhoun, when they declared that slavery existed by divine right, that it was of "patriarchal" origin and authority, and that it was even the "corner-stone" of the American government? How much better would any man be, for having been born and reared in the midst of such teachers, than if born in England or Germany, or even in Austria?

One of the members from Boston (Mr. Farwell) has, during this discussion, quoted the saying attributed to Washington, "Put none but Americans on guard!" His application of it is, that we should elect none but Americans to office, under any circumstances. Allow me, as I have said before, to define what makes an American, and I do not object to the doctrine. But I think there is not a little cast in this frequent reiteration of the alleged danger of having any other persons "on guard" than those born on American soil. Who, let me ask, sought to betray the cause of freedom, the native Frenchman? or Kosciuszko, the native of Poland? or Baran de Kuly, the native German? or Richard Montgomery, the native Englishman? No! It was a "Native American"—Benjamin Arnold—who was born in the wooden-nutting State of Connecticut! No true patriot or more devoted soldier participated in the struggle of the colonies against Great Britain, than was Baron de Steuben, the native Prussian, who cast in his lot with our Revolutionary sires, and, but for the timely aid of the State of New York in the grant of land, and a generous pension from Congress, would have died in poverty. He sought not to secure even posthumous distinction or homage, but made an earnest request that his body might not be buried with pomp and display, but wrapped in a cloak, and deposited in an obscure place, with no monument to mark the spot. Not one of his contemporaries was more shocked and grieved than he at the treacherous and perfidious character of Arnold. Says a historian of the time, "So great was his abhorrence of every thing mean and contemptible, that he could never endure the name of General Arnold, after that dishonorable officer proved a traitor to his country. While reviewing a regiment of light horse, the name of Arnold happened to strike his ear. The man who bore it was ordered to the front. He was a fine-looking fellow, with horse and equipments in excellent order. 'Change your name, brother soldier,' said the Baron, 'you are too respectable to bear the name of a traitor!' Verily, there is considerable nonsense in the implied assumption of a necessity that one should prove himself native-born, before he can be trusted out of sight!

To be consistent, and legitimately extend the ultra 'native' idea, those gentlemen who

POETRY.

THE CROWNING CRIME OF CHRISTENDOM.

BY JAMES HUBBARD.

I saw in the visions of night
An African village on fire!
The flames rolled along in their might,
And the shrieks of the victims rose higher and higher,
As of infant, and parent, and grey-headed sire.

The man-stealers sprang on their prey!
And hundreds were slain or subdued;
Some perished in utter dismay,
And others were slain while for mercy they sued;
And the soil they had filled with their blood was im-
bued.

One sight I shall never forget,
Till the sunbeam of life is denied,
And the star of my memory shall set:
A bridegroom, self-laughtered, enclasping his bride,
Who lay murdered, and mangled, and scorched by his
side.

The captives in fetters were bound,
Fear ran through their tremulous frames,
And they sobbed as they gazed round and round,
For where children that day had been playing their
games,
There were carcasses, and smouldering flames.

The vision fled slowly away,
And another appeared in its place:
I looked on a beautiful bay,
And ships in tranquility slept on its face:
They were slaves!—the pest of the African race.

On the shore was a horrible mart,
Where man was the merchandise sold,
Where the best blood that boils through the heart
Was bartered as though it were stolid and cold
As the storm-beaten rock, or the slave-dealer's gold!

Sweet babes from their mothers were torn—
Wives were rent from their husbands away—
And fond brothers asunder were borne—
And lovers were parted and sold for a stray,
To clasp hands never more till the great Judgment-day.

I heard them in anguish complain,
For life without love is but dross;
But they pleaded for mercy in vain,
For the demons who swore by the creed of the Cross,
Turned their faces away with an insolent frown.

I gazed on the hot iron brand,
As it hissed on each ebony skin,
I saw the slaves borne from the land
To a slave-ship, and packed in a large lathsome bin,
Where the stench seemed to quench the dull light that
stole in.

The vision fled slowly away,
And another appeared in its place:
Far around flashed the bright ocean spray,
And a ship sped along in her beauty and grace,
Bounding o'er the wild waves with the swift swallow's
pace.

But pestilence, madness and death
Raged and raved in her dark crowded hold,
And the slaves, as they drew their last breath,
Unconscious, unwept, ere their limbs were yet cold,
O'er the tall vessel's side were remorselessly rolled!

Swift, swift o'er the billowy main,
Flew onward that death-stricken bark,
And following as swift in her train
Swam many a monstrous and ravenous shark,
Gorging freely their fill of the carcasses dark.

As I gazed, the great deep was unsealed;
I looked down on the broad ocean's bed,
And a valley of bones was revealed,
Which shall yet be an army with banners outspread,
When the last trumpet sounds which shall waken the
dead!

The vision fled slowly away,
And another appeared in its place:
Before me a fair vision lay,
Where mountains rose high, like a huge giant race,
With sweet flowery fields lying calm at their base.

That land was the land of the slave!
The scene of his closing career!
Where the generous, the fond, and the brave,
Tolled on in their manacles, year after year,
Paid with stripes for their labor—their solace, a jeer.

I saw them worn out with their toil,
Urged on by the slave-driver's whip;
I saw the lash cruelly coil
Round their scar-crusted backs, till the warm blood
would drip,
While a groan faintly fell from the eloquent lip!

Enslaved both in body and mind,
The victims of grief and despair,
They seemed to their fortune resigned,
With no will of their own, for the future no care,
Like the dumb beasts of burden, whose lot is to bear.

I beheld a poor African chief,
Whose name was once honored afar,
Yet meekly he bore with his grief,
And sang to himself, 'Calabar! Calabar!
' 'Me could die in sweet peace could me see Calabar!'

The vision fled slowly away,
And another appeared in its place:
I witnessed the great Judgment-day!
And the branded, down-trodden, enslaved negro race,
With their tyrants and task-masters stood face to face!

Then spake One from the cloud which he trod—
'If man has no mercy on man,
HOW CAN MAN HOPE FOR MERCY FROM GOD?'
And a cry of despair through the multitude ran,
'There is no hope for men who have trafficked in man!'

TRY AGAIN.

How oft has disappointment marred
Some cherished plan of mine,
And hidden winter clouds appeared
Where summer's sun should shine!
Yet often as they darker grew,
I've seen some wondrous pen
Upon the very blackest write
The sentence—'Try again.'

How often in the stillly hour
Of night, the heavy sigh
In sympathy has strove to meet
The tear-drop in my eye;
And then like angels whispering
Their messages to men,
I've heard a quiet breathing of
The sentence—'Try again.'

How often, as I've walked amidst
Life's ever busy tide,
And jostled with its favor'd ones
On each and every side;
When my misfortunes seemed to be
O'erwhelming, even then
Has some good spirit breathed to me
The sentence—'Try again.'

My guardian angel it must be,
Or else the weight of care
Had sunk me in the very depths
Of sorrow and despair:
But, oh! my heart much lighter seems,
And hope shines brighter, when
I hear that spirit softly breathe
The sentence—'Try again.'

FREEDOM AND RIGHT.

Bound to no party, to no sect confined;
The world our home, our brethren all mankind.
Love truth—do good—be just and fair with all;
Exalt the Right, though every Jam fall.

THE LIBERATOR.

THE PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS.

DEAR FRIEND, W. L. GARRISON:

I send thee for insertion in *THE LIBERATOR*, if thou canst find room for it, a correspondence which took place between myself and Abram Pryne, then editor of the *Christian and Citizen*, published at Peterboro', N. Y., now, I think, of a paper called *The Reformer*, published at Syracuse. A principal reason for asking an insertion of the correspondence in *THE LIBERATOR* is the circumstance, that the last article in the series, in rejoinder to his Reply—which was promptly forwarded to him, with a request that he would give it a place in his paper—has not, that I am aware, been either published or noticed by him; although I have written him several times asking what had become of it, and, in the last instance, requesting the favor that, if he declined publishing it, he would return me the manuscript. But not a syllable have I received from him. What can have induced this singular conduct, on the part of friend Pryne, I am uninform, or how he can reconcile it with his professed character, as both editor and preacher, of 'reformer,' and the advocate of truth and anti-sectarian principles. I omit, for brevity, the insertion at length of my friend Pryne's notice of the Yearly Meeting, which led to the correspondence, as all that is material in that notice to the matters in discussion is embraced in my first article.

Lovingly thine for the promotion of truth and goodness,

THOMAS M'CLINTOCK.

WATERLOO, 7th month 10th, 1855.

ESTEEMED FRIEND A. PRYNE:
I have just read, in the *Christian and Citizen* of the 15th ult., which thou wast so kind as to send me, thy brief notice of the 'Yearly Meeting of Congregational Friends,' held here a few days previous. I want to say a word to thee and readers, regarding some remarks in that notice.

Thou sayest—'The movement is as yet merely negative. It denies the past, talks hopefully of the future in religion, but, I fear, comprehends and adapts itself to the present.' Now, here are several allegations to which I am impelled to demur, as calculated to give an erroneous impression of the Society.

1st. 'The movement is as yet merely negative.' I am at a loss to imagine on what thou couldst have predicated this assertion. If thou hast read the publications of the Society, and the Basis of Association on which it was organized, and which has been printed annually as an appendix to its proceedings, thou canst not, I think, have failed to perceive, that in both doctrine and practice it has been everything the reverse of negative, except in the sense in which every individual and association ought to be negative, to wit, by not following a multitude to do evil, in embracing the free exercise of conscience, by unsectarian creeds and tests.

2d. But in its principles and objects—in the great fundamentals of religion and morals—it surely is positive enough; at least I am certain it has been, from the first, the desire and intention of those engaged in the movement, to make it so. And hence we have invited reformers and conservatives, of all names and classes, (my friend Pryne with the rest,) to meet with us on a free platform, and give us the truth they deem important to mankind, however it may conflict with our own views. If, therefore, either in our theology, or in the practices advocated or opposed, we are not sufficiently positive, a good opportunity presents for the lovers of truth and man to make us so; and, I think, I may safely warrant them a kind and friendly hearing in their efforts. But it cannot be that my friend Pryne will now say that our 'movement is as yet merely negative, whatever, at the moment of penning the paragraph, may have led to the assertion. He saw, during his attendance at that meeting, too many vices and evils arrayed, and portrayed in their true character, to admit of the statement.

3d. 'It denies the past.' Is this true, as an unqualified proposition, or in any reprehensible sense? We believe truth is eternal, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, and gladly recognize it, where we can, in the records of the past. But, believing in the law of progressive development, in both physical and mental being, we cannot admit any collection of writings in the world as standards of truth, either in physics, religion, or morals; and to expect to find truth unimpaired by error in the records of remote ages, seems to us much more unreasonable than to look for it in those of the present age.

4th. As regards our hopefulness 'of the future in religion,' I hope this is true. And I can also readily entertain the 'fear,' that our movement 'hardly comprehends and adapts itself to the present.' For a reformatory society perfectly to comprehend and adapt its action to the present exigency, is an attainment as rare, probably, as it is desirable. I can only say, it is our aim to do so.

Again, thou sayest—'A reform that is not based upon Christianity is to be without a soul. Christ, merely as a moral head, is far above all others, and as a world Savior, is the star of our hope. Whatever good men can do on humanitarian ground merely, one can welcome and aid, but, at the same time, say to the world's reformers, come up higher into the gospel light.' The natural inference from what is here said, I think, is, that in thy estimation our reformatory action is not based upon Christianity—in other words, that the principles on which we operate are exclusive of Christianity, a carrying out, simply, of the benevolent principles of our nature. Now, our judgment of the correctness or incorrectness of the allegation will depend on our views respectively as to what Christianity is, and in what respect, if any, it differs from humanity; by which I mean the perfect development of man's nature. As regards the correct perception of truth on these points of great practical moment, the interest I feel in thee, and also our reformatory and anti-sectarian movement, leads me to desire that on all sides we may be right, and, if possible, 'see eye to eye.' To aid us in the investigation of the subject, permit me to propose for thy consideration the following questions:

1st. What is Christianity?
2d. When, and with whom did it originate?
3d. Is Christianity absolute religion—absolute morals, the result of the action of perfect and universal Divine laws, and therefore as old as the period when conscious moral agents existed to be the subjects of those laws, and at all times open to the cognizance and appreciation of man, by the principles of his nature; or is it an arbitrary code of religion and morals, which, having its origin at a particular period of the world, with a particular person or persons, rests on an historical basis, and is therefore an incidental and contingent truth, to be received on the authority of the declaration of a historical record?

4th. Are love to God and love to man the essence and substance of Christianity?
5th. Is not man, in the inherent principles of his nature, the work of Infinite Wisdom, Goodness, Power; and can that Wisdom and Goodness have conferred on him any one faculty, which, in its proper use, will not contribute to his perfection and happiness; and if so, will not all his faculties, properly used, secure his highest welfare, temporal and eternal? Can, therefore, Christianity, or true religion, be less or more than the harmonious and perfect development of man's divinely endowed powers? And are not the religious and moral among the constituent elements of his being?

6th. Is there any other salvation for the world than this: 'to cease to do evil, and learn to do good?'—in other words, that mankind, by the power dispensed to them from the Fountain of Infinite Perfection, Infinite Wisdom and Goodness, overcome the perverted action of their God-like faculties, and attain to their normal and harmonious exercise? Would not this save all from vice and its attendant miseries, and fit them for the enjoyment of God and religion, and all that is lovely and beautiful on earth?

Thine for truth and humanity,
THOMAS M'CLINTOCK.

REPLY TO THOMAS M'CLINTOCK.

We gave, at the time we wrote on that subject, our impressions concerning the 'Progressive Friends.' These impressions remain the same as when first expressed, and we proceed to justify them. We think the movement negative, because it does not propose any definite line of conduct by which to combine its efforts to reform the world. It has no preachers, lecturers, publications or special agencies, that we know of, through which it acts. Its basis is a statement of abstract principles, but presents no associated plan for carrying them out. It denounces slavery, but refuses to vote against it. It rebukes governmental crimes, but refuses to elect just men as rulers, or vote at all. 'Vices and evils were arrayed,' but no practical plan, other than that of bearing 'testimony' on general principles, was adopted to destroy these vices. To us, such an association is 'merely negative.'

7th. 'It denies the past.' Our friend M'Clintock proves our statement at this point to be correct, by saying, 'We cannot admit any collection of writings in the world as standards of truth.' Of course, this is denying the authority of the Bible as a standard, and as this Bible has given character to the past, to deny it is to deny the past. This declaration is even more definite and sweeping in its denials than our charge. We need say nothing more on that point.

8th. That the movement is ill-adapted to the present is proved by its negative character. It presents no plan of associated and combined action for the overthrow of popular sins, or the systematic cultivation, as social beings, of the graces and virtues of Christianity. It repudiates Christ as its head or leader, and his church as a model of religious society. Instead of regeneration, it talks of development. All society is a development of what is now in the human heart, and before development can help us, the soul, to be developed, must first be regenerated. Until you preach regeneration, instead of development, you will fail to 'adapt your movements to the present.' All the crimes of to-day are but developments of what is in man. He must have a new interior life before he can manifest a new outward life.

9th. Love to God and love to man are the essence of Christianity. But Jesus Christ is an authoritative exponent of the tests and 'applications of love to God and man; and that movement that rejects him as authoritative in guiding and enlightening that love, is not to be trusted as an exponent or exemplar of that love.

10th. Christianity originated in the bosom of God, and in its essential principles is older than all the records of time, and had its birth before material things took form. But Jesus came in a dark age to reveal and restore it, and that revelation and restoration is authoritative, both in general and in particulars. He who denies that authority wanders guideless through the fields of religious speculation. His system is not arbitrary, but is imperative, because founded upon infinite reason, and where human reason is too weak to see the truth, faith links it to the divine reason, and it follows Christ as a guide.

11th. The proper 'use of our faculties' will lead us to perfection. But Christ reveals to us the only way to cultivate and properly use these faculties, and when we reject him, there is no hope that we will properly cultivate or use these faculties. Christianity is more than the 'development' of man's powers. It regenerates and directs these powers in the road of development; and he who seeks this end by any other than its divinely appointed means, will fail.

12th. There is no salvation except in ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well. But man, with his already perverted faculties, is not to be trusted to learn what is evil, and how to do well; and hence God sent his Son into the world to show us the way of goodness, and by his Spirit move us to walk in that way. If we reject him, we are sure to remain still. He is the 'Way' from error to goodness, the 'Truth,' which makes us free, and the model of the 'Life' of the true man. The simple fact that these Friends profess to love truth and follow goodness is no evidence of the value of their movement. All sets in Christian and heathen lands make the same high professions. Hume, Bolingbroke and Voltaire were professed worshippers at the shrine of virtue and truth. But they rejected the Bible and the Savior as authority, and, of course, failed to find truth or virtue. Every modern phase of infidelity has come up as a reform, and professed a better and broader plan of redeeming the race than the plan of Christ. Taking as a basis love to God and man, and truth as a guide, is indeed to adopt some beautiful and taking phraseology; but when we reject the great model and exemplar of both as our guide, our profession is liable to be only a new and specious form of selfishness. To affirm that reason and the human soul are absolute, and that our own minds are to be our only guide, is, in our estimation, blank infidelity, and whatever may be the good we seek, on such a basis, we shall only fall into darkness.

WATERLOO, 8th month, 7th, 1854.

ESTEEMED FRIEND, A. PRYNE:
I write not for controversy, but truth; truth for thee, truth for myself, and for all who may happen to read or give attention to what may pass between us. I am a good deal disappointed in thy answer. I expected a ready admission, that in asserting that the movement of the 'Congregational or Progressive Friends' is 'merely negative,' 'denies the past,' &c., thou hadst spoken precipitately. I expected this, because the case appeared to me too plain to admit of difference of opinion. And allow me to say, the grounds of thy justification seem to me not less inconclusive than the primary positions. Let us look at them as briefly as we can, with perspicuity.

1. 'We think the movement negative, because it does not propose any definite line of conduct by which to combine its efforts to reform the world.' Incorrect. Our Basis of Association constitutes all our meetings a free platform, on which every individual may exercise his conscience, without impediment, in promulgating truth, according to his convictions, in all its attractions and power, and in detecting and portraying error in all its injurious properties and hideous forms. And our 'larger meetings—Quarterly or Yearly'—it is expressly stated, are to be 'for counsel and advice, and for the consideration and promotion of the great interests of humanity, of every thing that concerns man at large, including, of course, the removal of the evils of slavery, of the war, of slavery, of intemperance, licentiousness, or in whatever form cruelty, injustice, and other perverted principles, may operate.' Is this a negative movement? Is there here no definite line of conduct by which to combine effort? If there is not, I know not where to find it. Was there any thing more definite in the action of what is called the primitive church—the assemblies which witnessed the labors of Jesus and his apostles? Was their movement, too, 'merely negative'? I am sure ours embraces what Paul calls 'the foolishness of preaching,' by which, he says, 'it pleased God to save them that believe.' It is the preaching of righteousness, and a practice corresponding with it, that we hope to do something toward the redemption of the world. The one principal of association, practically securing perfect liberty of conscience to all, irrespective of age, sex, condition or opinion, is itself a mighty element of a positive character, destined, I trust, most beneficially to mould other associations; and of which I have yet to find a parallel in any other professedly religious bodies. Show me such, and I will gladly hail them as brethren and co-workers in human redemption.

2. 'It has no preachers, lecturers, publications, or special agencies, that we know of, through which it acts.' Strangely incorrect. We have 'preachers,' a goodly number; and had my friend Pryne attended the meeting on First-day morning and afternoon, he could not have made the assertion. Preaching, as I have said, is with us, as in the apostolic church, the distinguishing instrumentality. We have our publications, too, which we have issued from time to time, and which have been productive of decided effects in at-

tracting the attention of many to the important principles of our movement. And these, and our preachers, are the 'special agencies' through which we act. True, we have no periodical newspaper organ, nor hired lecturers, though there is nothing to prevent our having both, if deemed wise and right. But are these indispensable to give the positive element to society? If so, the society of truth-loving reformers in the apostolic day were destitute of that element. But the affirmative seems to me too absurd to be entertained for a moment.

3. 'Its Basis is a statement of abstract principles, but presents no associated plan of carrying them out.' Entirely incorrect, as already shown.

4. 'It denounces slavery, but refuses to vote against it. It rebukes governmental crimes, but refuses to elect just men as rulers, or vote at all.' Incorrect, as regards both principle and fact. As a body, we have no law against voting or participating in the government of the country in which we live. Many do vote, and do participate. Others conscientiously decline, of which class I am one. I never voted for a government officer but once, and that very many years since, and then did not cast a full vote. But in this, we leave each to be fully persuaded in his own mind, and accord the right freely to express our convictions on the subject, in meetings or out, on the one side or the other. To give my own views specifically now, would occupy too much space for this article; I will simply say, they admit of cooperation with human governments in all things in which they are not in conflict with the Divine government, or in which cooperation, no partnership exists in works of unrighteousness. But here again I may refer thee, as *argumentum ad hominem*, to thy 'model' and 'world-savior.' Did he vote, or participate in the governments that then were, or recommend others to do so? 'My kingdom,' he said, 'is not of this world; if it were, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews. And did not his immediate disciples, and their converts generally, decline such participation? They seem to have thought, with their Teacher, that there was a greater instrumentality for doing good than voting. 'To this end,' said he, 'was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth'—which, from the declaration preceding, just cited, meant other witness to the truth than voting and participating in despotic, persecuting, war-making and slavery-sustaining governments.

5. And now as to the charge that 'it denies the past.' 'Our friend M'Clintock,' thou says, 'proves our statement at this point to be correct, by saying, "We cannot admit any collection of writings in the world as standards of truth." Of course, this is denying the authority of the Bible as a standard; and as this Bible has given character to the past, to deny it is to deny the past.' This to me is a marvellous justification. Let us look at it. Not to admit any collection of writings in the world as perfect standards of truth, (for of such standards the context shows I was speaking,) is to deny the authority of the Bible as a standard; and as this Bible has given character to the past, to deny it is to deny the past! Have no other writings than those in the Bible given character to the past? Have not the sacred books of the Hindoos, the writings of Confucius, the Koran of Mahomet, the words of the philosophers and civilians of Greece and Rome—not to speak of the thousands of more modern dates—have not these all 'given character to the past'? and to deny them as standards of truth, is that to deny the past? Plainly not. To deny any fact or truth of history is so far to deny the past. But have I not, 'We gladly recognize truth, where we can, in the records of the past?' All of the past is before us for examination, and none of its archives are to be accepted, without competent evidence, as 'standards,' either in physics, morals, or religion. To do so is inevitably to give up our minds to the conduct of error. And let me ask, What dost thou mean by 'the authority of the Bible'? Has it any authority other than the evidence and force of the truth it contains? And how are we to get evidence of truth, but by the action of perfect laws, provided of God for its revelation to us? And as God is at every point of every law that operates, it is correctly said that he reveals it to us by his spirit, 'even the deep things of God.' In regard to moral and religious truth, so beautifully has he adjusted the human mind, in its normal action, to its perception, that, in respect to the great essential principles, it seems to shine by its own light; it is self-evident; it comes by intuition; it presents itself at the very point of duty where we need it. Though strictly, no doubt, it is revealed to us by Divine Light, as external objects are revealed by the light of the sun.

The 'authority of the Bible,' then, that which gives validity to any moral or religious truths it contains, is the Light of God in the mind. The authority of the Bible, therefore, and the Bible itself, are two very different things. The first is our highest and most perfect standard; the last, a repository of important truths and hurtful errors, between which it is its indispensable duty to discriminate by the light God gives us. Let me ask thee, dost thou accept the whole Bible as the truth of God, and thy standard of faith and practice—Old Testament and New? If not, which part dost thou accept, and how far? And what determines thee in thy choice? These are momentous practical questions. Be so good as to give me a clear and full answer to them.

I am disappointed in thy reply, in another respect: it fails to answer the important question I first proposed, and on which must turn most of the real or apparent difference between us, viz., what is Christianity? I find assertions as to what Christianity does, but no statement of what Christianity is. I would accept thy admission, that 'love to God and love to man are its essence,' but that thou hast thrown around this admission so much of an extraneous character as to deprive it, to a great extent, of its value as a definition. Let us endeavor to understand each other in this matter. In order to do this, we will look at thy main positions bearing on the subject. These may be comprised in some half dozen propositions, which, for perspicuity, I will state and examine.

1. 'The essence of Christianity is love to God and love to man. It originated in the bosom of God. It had its birth before material things took form. Its essential principles are anterior to all the records of time.'

To this proposition, of course, I have no objection, except it be the incongruity of the existence of a religion before human beings existed to be the subjects of it. The statement contains two important concessions: 1. That love to God and man is the essence or substance of Christianity. 2. That it had its birth before Jesus had his birth, being in its essential principles older than all the records of time. It did not, therefore, originate with him, but stands independent of any necessary connection, either with Jesus or the Bible. And it must needs be so, if it be absolute or true religion—the tie which binds the finite to the Infinite—(and if not that, we want something better.) For, to suppose that so important and sublime a provision was omitted until many thousand years after the creation of mankind, would be sadly to reflect on the Divine goodness. But this point also is conceded in thy statement, that 'Jesus came in a dark age to reveal and restore it.' Had it not previously existed, not only in principle, but practice, it could not be restored.

2. 'Jesus of Nazareth—called "the Christ," and "Son of God"—is the only authoritative exponent of what constitutes love to God and man, having been sent of God to that end. He came in a dark age, to reveal and restore Christianity.—(that is, to show men what love to God is, and what love to man is, and to bring them to the experience of both.) And that revelation, which is contained in the record of the doctrine and practice of Jesus is authoritative in all cases of faith and practice; he who deviates from it "wanders guideless through the fields of religious speculation." We have substituted "only authoritative exponent" for "an authoritative exponent," used by thee, the sentence

following—"he who denies that authority wanders guideless." &c.—seem clearly to demand it. Besides, I find the word 'only' subsequently used by thee in an equivalent sense. Any other sense, indeed, would vitiate thy argument, as every good man is 'an authoritative exponent of love to God and man.' He gives demonstrable evidence of both in his daily life, his piety and benevolence. But how can it be true that Jesus is the only exponent of love to God and man, or 'of the tests and applications' of love to God and man? Did not thousands, of all nations, before his advent, feel that love, and give evidence that they understood its tests and applications too?—and thousands since that time, who never had access to the record of his doctrine? Had not God implanted the principles of both in man's nature, no declaration of Jesus, nor any one else, could convey to a single human being an understanding of either, nor of their 'tests and applications.' Canst thou refer me to any tests or applications of this principle, which had not been previously recognized by enlightened minds? When the scribe inquired of Jesus, which was the greatest commandment, he referred him to two injunctions of the Pentateuch, embracing the very principle of love to God and man, without the slightest intimation that there was any thing new in it, and the scribe as readily recognized their importance, saying they were 'more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.'

3. 'The proper use of all our faculties will lead us to perfection, but only the doctrine and practice of Jesus, as exhibited in the record, can show us the way to cultivate and properly use our faculties.'

If Jesus has given any dissertation on the culture and use of our faculties, I should like to see it. His only teaching applicable to the point, that I remember, was to refer all to the law written in the mind.

4. 'It is true, there is no salvation but in ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well. But here, again, it is only by reference to the teaching and life of Jesus, that we can know what is evil, and how to do well. Man's faculties, already perverted, are not to be trusted with the decision. The doctrines of Jesus comprise a system or plan for redeeming the race, the reception of which is imperative on all, because founded on infinite reason; and though our reason fail to see its truth, we must adopt it, and follow Christ as a guide. Yet is this system not arbitrary, though it require a blind and unreasoning faith.'

Here, again, I am glad to find the admission of a fundamental truth, that there is no salvation but in ceasing to do evil, and learning to do good. No man, nor race of men, can be saved or redeemed, but by ceasing from the practice of evil, and in the proportion that they do so. To the extent that any one is in the practice of it, he is its slave and victim, and must suffer the penalty. And dost thou mean to say, that none before Jesus came knew evil and good, and were saved from the former, and blessed by the latter?—or that none now can have this knowledge, without recurrence to his life and teaching? Then indeed has the condition of the countless myriads of mankind, before and since, been indescribably deplorable! Yet this is the legitimate deduction from thy position, that 'Christ only reveals to us the way to use our faculties,' and that these faculties are 'not to be trusted to learn what is evil, and how to do well.' Thou wilt perceive that the proposition I have deduced from the positions taken in thy remarks, lands in the doctrine of *implicit faith*! I think the deduction fair and inevitable from the premises. If thou thinkst otherwise, please make it appear. And here let me remark, that thy assertion that the system of Jesus (if any thing properly to be denominated a system can be deduced from the existing record of his life and doctrines) is founded on infinite reason, is but an assumption, and needs proof. Beautiful as was his life, and generally excellent his doctrines, he was human and finite, and therefore not infallible. By the statement of the record itself, he 'increased in wisdom,' and therefore had not all of it. Like other prophets and divine messengers, he 'saw in part, and prophesied in part.' And let me ask thee, art thou ready to take his doctrine and practice, in all things, as thy pattern? If so, I think thou wilt find thyself very much of a Jew. For, although he made war on the defective moral code of Moses, there is no evidence in the history, that I am aware of, that he declined the practice of the rituals of the law, or commanded others to do so, but various examples of his observance of them.

But I want to say a word here on the question of the truthfulness of the human faculties, and the matter of infidelity. And in order to a clear understanding between us, I will introduce another of thy positions.

5. 'To affirm that reason and the human soul are absolute, and that our own minds are to be our only guide, is blank infidelity.'

Now, reason is absolutely reason, and the human soul is absolutely a soul, a spiritual, immortal principle in man; and reason is one of its attributes, the highest gift of God to man, the combined action of its various faculties, that by which it perceives, compares, deduces, decides, and judges of all things, and without which it could neither know nor judge. But if thou means by 'absolute,' that reason and the human soul stand independent of any other cause, and that, in this sense, our own minds are our only guide—to affirm that is not only 'infidelity,' but *atheism*. The human soul stands in connection with physical and spiritual being. With the first, through the bodily senses; with the last, by its own properties. Man is dependent, for existence and all his powers, on the Infinite God. In this absolute sense, he creates nothing, reveals nothing; he is simply the recipient and steward of the manifold bounty of God. Through his bodily senses, he may know the things of physical nature; and through his spiritual faculties, he may know the things of spiritual being, so far as God intended him to know. Through these powers, which God has conferred on him as elements of his being, they are revealed to him as facts of consciousness. They are revealed by their own presence, through the appropriate media; if external objects of vision, through the medium of physical light; if spiritual things, through the medium of spiritual light. In regard to physical nature, others' vision is not sight to him; and when he sees an object, he does not need the word of another to make him know that he sees it. The testimony of another may be a confirmation of the truth of his own senses. And the testimony of others, in regard to objects which have not come within the action of his senses, may be sufficient to put him in *undoubting* possession of the facts reported. But if he doubts the testimony—if it is discrepant—if it conflicts with any great natural law, the existence of which he knows by his own experience, and he think it of sufficient moment to be certain regarding its truth—he must place himself in the required condition, by proximity to it, or the use of such instruments as will bring it within the purview of his senses. And so of spiritual things. They are revealed to our minds by spiritual light, the light of God, with as much certainty as external things to our bodies by the light of the sun. And as we faithfully use our spiritual faculties, we shall as certainly see all the truth it imports up to see, and understand its application to practice, as by the right use of our physical powers, we can see external things, and learn their character and uses. And our faculties, in both cases, must be *truthworthy*, or there is an end to all knowledge; it is folly to talk about it, either in morals, mathematics, or any department of science. For it is by these faculties we judge of things, properties, relations, principles, results, morals, religion; in short, of *revelation itself*, and all that is revealed. We have nothing else by which to do it. God has given them to us to that end, and holds us responsible for their use. This responsibility is individual and personal; and hence, though we are intended in all things to be ministers of reciprocal benefits to each other, in judging of the great matters of truth and error, right and wrong, we are to trust our own minds in preference to the mind of any other. For the revelation to our own minds must be

more certain to us than any revelation, or history of a revelation, made, or said to be made, to another. And the decision of our own minds, however perverted their faculties, must be to us imperative in regard to duty.

So taught Jesus: 'Why judge ye not of yourselves what is right?' He did not tell them their faculties were not to be trusted to decide what is evil and what is good, but everywhere in his appeals took for granted their reliability; recognizing the self-evident truth, that, as Locke well expresses it, our 'reason must be our last judge and guide in everything.' And so far is this from infidelity, it is fidelity to God and truth, in the use of those faculties he has given us to judge with.

But let me refer thee to a type of infidelity that is abroad in the land, and which, clothed in sacerdotal vestments, from the more than imperial robe of the 'successor of St. Peter,' to the simple black coat of the last sub-division of protestant sects, and with its phylactery inscribed with the name of the lovely young Nazarene, mounts the pulpit and occupies the professor's chair. Its teaching is, that formerly God inspired men, breathed into them truth, wisdom, goodness, so that they had them at first hand. The word of God came to them; they heard for themselves and understood. Revelation was then a living, internal, personal experience, as the perception of objects by the sun's light is a personal experience. To find it, men had not to look out of themselves; it was an unfolding of God and his will, and his relation and duties, by the light of God's spirit, the present operation of his perfect laws. But now inspiration and revelation are in a book; it is not to be had direct as formerly. God spoke his last direct word more than eighteen hundred years ago, when the last tract in the Bible was penned. The Bible of God's Book, God's word, emphatically inspiration and revelation, the highest we can get; God's supreme law, and the rule of practice to all men. Thus it claims the first and greatest of all Divine truths, that on which all others depend, God's present and continuous action in the world of mind, as in the world of matter. It denies God's omnipotence and unchangeableness; for, unless he has changed, and is remote from us, he necessarily sustains the same relation to the human mind he ever did, and inspiration is the same it ever was. It denies his impartial goodness, his parental character, in making him better to his children of past ages than to those of the present; for he would not infinitely prefer to hear a parent's word, receive from himself his will or testament, than have it repeated by another? especially one in the same flesh and blood sphere with ourselves, where there would be liability of innocent error, or fraudulent design? Instead of calling men to the sacred sanctuary of the soul, where only God's presence can be known, and where only he can be worshipped in spirit and in truth,